UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,982	01/02/2004	Tom Musolf	020824-003512US	5472
	7590 07/31/200 AND TOWNSEND AN		EXAMINER	
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			HADIZONOOZ, BANAFSHEH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/31/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/750,982	MUSOLF ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Banafsheh Hadizonooz	3714	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 D     2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This     3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under B	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 60-70 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 60-70 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct to by the Example 2.	cepted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the I	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

## **Detailed Action**

In response to the correspondence filed on 12/10/2007 claims 60-70 are pending.

Claims 1-59 have been cancelled. This office action is made **Non-Final**.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 60, 62-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch et al. (US 6,668,156) in view of Padgett (Us 6,421,524) and further in view of Taylor et al. (US D436,100 S).

[Claims 60]: Regarding claims 60 Lynch discloses a platform comprising a surface and a display screen (e.g. the touch sensitive screen)(See Fig. 4); a print medium suitable for placement on the surface (See Fig.11), a plurality of electrical elements in the platform and under the surface (See Col.5, 29-45); a microprocessor coupled to the plurality of electrical elements and codes for controlling the functionality of print media receiving unit (See Col.4, 57-63 and Col.6, 8-15); Lynch does not specifically discloses memory for recording the user's voice, and code for playing it back. Lynch also does not disclose record/playback options. Padgett discloses an electronic talking book including an audio recording/playback option and memory to store user's voice (See Col.2, 38-58) and audio input and output means (See

Art Unit: 3714

Col.3, 29-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of Padgett's invention into the system and method of Lynch in order to design an interactive learning system.

Lynch/Padgett do not expressly disclose a microphone structure with head and neck portion that is fixedly attached to the platform. However, Taylor discloses an electronic sound book with a microphone that is fixedly attached to the platform (See Figs.2 and 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of Taylor into the system and method of Lynch/Padgett in order to design a system that is more child-friendly in that it doesn't allow the child to remove the microphone and loose it.

[Claim 62]: Taylor further discloses a recessed area for receiving the microphone in the platform (See Fig. 8).

[Claim 63]: regarding claim 63 Padgett further discloses record and playback print elements (See Abstract).

[Claim 64]: Lynch discloses a system wherein the platform is foldable (See Fig.9).

[Claim 65]: With respect to claim 65, Lynch further discloses that the print medium comprises print elements for a game or for a story (e.g. book) (See Col. 5, 16-29, Fig. 10).

Claims 61, 67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch et al. (US 6,668,156) in view of Padgett (Us 6,421,524)

Art Unit: 3714

and further in view of Taylor et al. (US D436,100 S) and further in view of Arad et al. (5,679,049).

[Claims 61, 67 and 68]: Regarding claims 60 Lynch discloses a platform comprising a surface and a display screen (e.g. the touch sensitive screen)(See Fig. 4); a print medium suitable for placement on the surface (See Fig.11), a plurality of electrical elements in the platform and under the surface (See Col.5, 29-45); a microprocessor coupled to the plurality of electrical elements and codes for controlling the functionality of print media receiving unit (See Col.4, 57-63 and Col.6, 8-15); Lynch does not specifically discloses memory for recording the user's voice, and code for playing it back. Lynch also does not disclose record/playback options. Padgett discloses an electronic talking book including an audio recording/playback option and memory to store user's voice (See Col.2, 38-58) and audio input and output means (See Col.3, 29-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of Padgett's invention into the system and method of Lynch in order to design an interactive learning system.

Lynch/Padgett do not expressly disclose a microphone structure with head and neck portion that is fixedly attached to the platform. However, Taylor discloses an electronic sound book with a microphone that is fixedly attached to the platform (See Figs.2 and 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of Taylor into the system and method of Lynch/Padgett in order to design a system that is more child-friendly in that it doesn't allow the child to remove the microphone and loose it.

As for the feature of dummy microphone, Lynch/Padgett/Taylor do not disclose a dummy microphone. Arad discloses a toy telephone system wherein the peaker and the microphone are installed inside the base of the telephone system, and wherein the handset is only connected to the base by a non-electric wire and has no functionality (See Abstract and Claims 8 and 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the feature of Arad's invention into the system and method of Lynch/Padgett/Taylor in order to persuade the child to record his/her voice.

[Claim 69]: Lynch further discloses a memory device in the body storing code for audio outputs (See Col.6, 8-15).

Claim 66 is rejected under 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lynch et al. (US 6668156) in view of Padgett (US 6421524) further in view of Taylor et al. (US D436,100 S) as applied to claim 60 above and further in view of Rothschild et al. (5,603,652).

[Claims 66]: regarding claim 66, Lynch/Padgett/Taylor do not expressly disclose LEDs in the microphone structure. Rothschild discloses a microphone structure with a light source on its structure for visual communication with the user (See Abstract and Col.2, 32-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of Rothschild's invention into the system and method of Lynch/Padgett/Taylor in order to design a system that is more attractive to children.

Claim 70 is rejected under 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lynch et al. (US 6668156) in view of Padgett (US 6421524) further in view of Taylor et al. (US D436,100 S) and further in view of Arad et al. (US 5,679, 049) as applied to claim 67 above and further in view of Rothschild et al. (5,603,652).

[Claim 70]: Lynch/Padgett/Taylor do not expressly disclose LEDs in the microphone structure. Rothschild discloses a microphone structure with a light source on its structure for visual communication with the user (See Abstract and Col.2, 32-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of Rothschild's invention into the system and method of Lynch/Padgett/Taylor in order to design a system that is more attractive to children.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 60-70 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Banafsheh Hadizonooz whose telephone number is 571-272-1242. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/750,982 Page 7

Art Unit: 3714

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272- 6788. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BH 07/25/2008

/Robert E Pezzuto/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714